



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The *a*-sound differs from the unrounded back vowels in that it does not require an elevation of the back of the tongue; it differs from the mixed and front unrounded vowels in that it demands a larger cavity in the centre and front of the mouth, and a stoppage of the cavity behind the tongue.

It is also possible to produce *a* in two more artificial ways—by lateral compression of the tongue, and by protrusion of the tongue beyond the lips.

With the jaw at any height, and with the tongue in any unrounded position, narrow or wide, low, mid, or high, front or mixed (but not back), we can form an *a*-sound by so compressing the tongue that it is thin from side to side and thick from top to bottom, provided the hyoid bone be retracted and the lip-aperture be such as to allow the sound to escape freely at the sides. By this method an *a* can be produced which, as seen from the lips, has the appearance of being high-front or high-mixed; examination will, however, show that this *a* is accompanied by no lowering of the back of the tongue. All the back vowels can, moreover, be formed in this same way: they differ from one-another in the height of the back of the tongue; from *a* they are distinguished apparently by the fact that they require an upward slope from front to back, whereas for *a* the top of the tongue is about level.

If the mouth-aperture be tolerably large, and the tongue be kept flat and free from any local elevation, *a* can be pronounced with the tongue extended far beyond the lips. All the low vowels can be produced with this same tongue-protrusion: the low-back (as in *saw*) and the low-mixed (as in *sir*) require, however, an elevation respectively of the back and of the centre of the tongue; *æ* demands a lifting in the front of the mouth and a sinking at the back. *E* can also be produced in this way, but with less protrusion than *æ*; *i* admits still less than *e*: for narrow *i* the tongue can scarcely project beyond the lower lip.

Putting together all the evidence we have gathered, we conclude that *a* is an unrounded hollow vowel, hollower than the low mixed, and not so hollow as *ɔ*. When it is pronounced in the mid-back or low-back position, its re-

quisite front cavity is already there; but when it is carried forward, room has to be made for it by lowering the jaw or by flattening, hollowing, or compressing the tongue.

C. H. GRANDGENT,
E. S. SHELDON.

Harvard University.

ERRATA IN THE SIEVERS-COOK OLD ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

May I request students of the 'Old English Grammar' to make the following corrections in addition to those noted by DR. BRIGHT in the March number (p. 82) of this journal?

§ 68. For *silver* read *sliver*.

§ 85. For 'an accented' read 'a stressed.'

§ 207. For 'smooth guttural and the smooth palatal' read 'surd guttural stop and the surd palatal stop.'

§ 214 (p. 114, second line). For *āwæh* (*āweh*) read *āwæh* (*āweh*).

§ 214, Note 3. For *frunon*, *gefrunen*, *brudon*, *broden*, *stroden* read *frūnon*, *gefrūnen*, *brūdon*, *brōden*, *strōden*.

§ 214, Note 4. For *merne* read *mērne*.

§ 227. For 'Germanic *ðð*' read 'Germanic *þþ*.'

§ 271. For *cwið* read *cwið*.

§ 288, Note 1. Supply the missing portion of the parenthesis after *scēf*.

§ 382, Note 1. For *ācwīnan* read *ācwīnan*.

§ 407, (a). For *ræccan* read *ræcean*.

Page 168 (middle). For '225.2 *b*' read '225.2.' For '145. and note' read '145.'

Page 262. For 'oððe, conj. 277' read 'oððe, conj. 200.'

Page 263. For *plēloic* read *plēolic*.

Page 264. Under *sculan*, for 243 read 423.

ALBERT S. COOK.

University of California.

THE ORIGIN OF THE SUFFIX -re in French *ordre*, *coffre*, *pampre*, etc.

IN LENZ'S 'Der Handschuhsheimer Dialekt,* I. Teli: Wörterverzeichnis.' Konstanz 1887, we read on page 23: "Beiläufig will ich bemer-

*LENZ's treatise on his native dialect is certainly a most valuable addition to our dialect investigations and it promises to be much more so after the publication of the second part.

ken, dass ich fürs afr. eine entwicklung von lateinischem nachtonigen, sonantisch gewordenen *n* zu *r* annehme, also *ordinem*+conson. anlaut: *ordr* (geschriebenen *ordre*), *ordinem*+vocal. anlaut: *orne*, s. Diez Wtbch⁴. 650. Cf. auch franz. *dartre*, Langres, *havre*, *diacre*, *Estevre*, *dombre*." When a phonetic law is formulated with such restrictions as these, the lack of material will often make it very difficult to prove either its entire impossibility or its absolute necessity. In favor of the case discussed here, we might be inclined to quote the analogy of a similar, although not an equivalent sound-change in Spanish; and the persistence of the consonant before the *r* shows that we have indeed to deal with an original *n* and *r* sonans. Yet, when we examine the question in connection with other facts, we may perhaps come to a different conclusion, and prefer an explanation which I wish here to submit to the consideration of Romance scholars.

We will first add to LENZ's list: *Acre* (ACCON) *coffre* (COPHINUM) *pampre* (PAMPINUM); some other words may have escaped our attention. The *-re* of these words, according to my opinion, is due not to any phonetic law but to an analogical change of suffix, caused by the many nouns in *-re*, which normally existed in the language: *prestre*, *fenestre*, *maistre*, *arbre*, etc., etc. It is true, that this *-re* never became a really "living suffix" in French, but we cannot help admitting its influence in the formation of such words as *esclandre*, *apôtre*, *titre*, *chapitre*, *épître*, *martre*,

chartre, *costre*, *cordre*, and especially *Sambre*, *celestre*, *escientre*, *encre*, *diantre*, *gouffre*, *filandre*, perhaps *goinfre*, *gouliafre*, *safr* and others of doubtful origin.

On the other hand, some of the nouns with *n* in their etymon occur also without the *r*. They have, then, preserved the *n*, and still the preceding consonant has not disappeared, which proves that here also *n* was originally *sonans*: *juéfne*, *Estefne*, *ordene*; we must, of course, not quote *asne*, *chesne*, *almosne* in this connection, nor *imagine*, which is not a popular word but a learned form, as nearly all its sounds show. *Hâve* (beside *havre*) has entirely lost the suffix, and other double forms of a similar character are *golfe*: *gouffre*, *coulte*: *cotre*, *marle*: *martre*, (while *Montmarthe*: *Montmartre* should probably be understood differently). Consequently there must have been in the language some uncertainty as regards the suffix *-re*, and we have just seen that it *must* have been added analogically in some cases. The question accordingly arises, whether we shall simply admit its influence in all the forms concerned, or whether we prefer to lay down phonetic laws, based upon only a few words which can be easily explained otherwise.

GUSTAF KARSTEN.

Indiana University.

DÉSIRÉ NISARD AND THE HISTORY OF LITERATURE.

A noticeable feature of the reminiscences of DÉSIRÉ NISARD in the French periodicals is the absence of views on his influence as a critic. Old pupils of the École Normale sketch his directorship of that institution, his personal bearing, his attitude towards the Empire, comment on the legend of the "Two Morals," but in their mention of his works cast hardly a glance at his master-piece, nor attempt an estimate of his services as a historian of literature.

Reasons for this neglect are obvious. The memory of NISARD's campaign against Romanticism, much more his silence in the face of Realism, unite to make all literary critics of the present generation hostile to him. The few adherents of the Classical school have not yet spoken.

I wish that some thorough specialist in Germanics would make our readers acquainted with the chief results obtained by the author.—Here only a few questions: the first element of *lätmūt* seems to be the German *Leid*?—May *mästung* (suffix *-ung* instead of *-ing*) contain or be influenced by *Dung*?—Should not mhd. *meister* *meinster* have been brought into connection with *weist*, *meinst*, rather than with *mein*? *Meinst* might have received the nasal from *minst*, *minnest*.—*pašte* reminds one of *ab-basteln*.—*truñ* seems to be connected with *troddel*.—With "*as kot esprich*" cp. the Swiss "*as mü chit*," and the Saxon "*als Got der Herre*" (in 'BLIEMCHEN IN LONDON'). *Der Herre* in the Saxon saying is, of course, a transformation of some form of *reden*. But the whole expression remains difficult to explain.—If the exclamation *ma!* could be simply understood as the possessive pron. *mein* *sc.* *Gott*, it might be compared with the English *O my!* and *dear me!* I think *dear me* is not, as generally believed=Italian *dio mio*, but=*dear my Lord*, the last word being left out for obvious reasons.